



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,685	02/23/2004	Atsushi Osawa	P/1596-73	8368
2352 7590 09/17/2007 OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			EXAMINER GEORGE, PATRICIA ANN	
			ART UNIT 1765	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/785,685	Applicant(s) OSAWA, ATSUSHI	
	Examiner Patricia A. George	Art Unit 1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/26/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10, drawn to methods, classified in class 216, subclass 83.
- II. Claims 11-16, drawn to apparatus, classified in class 156, subclass 345.11.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus, such as an apparatus for treating a substrate coated with a film including a material of low dielectric constant.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. James Finder on 9/6/2007 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, method claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this

Art Unit: 1765

Office action. Claims 11-16 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pacheco Rotondaro et al. (2003/0109106 – filed 12/06/2001).

Pacheco Rotondaro et al. teaches methods for any suitable process (i.e. treating the substrate), including those used for substrates (see ab.) coated with silicon dioxide

Art Unit: 1765

or TEOS (i.e. silicon thermal oxidation film) and high-k dielectrics (see para. 19) comprising use of a solution that contains sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄) and hydrofluoric acid (HF), in proportions of 25:0.015, which encompasses by applicants' specifically claimed range of at most 1% by weight of hydrofluoric acid (HF), as in claims 1 and 2; use of any high-K dielectric material (para. 0018), including oxides of aluminum Al, hafnium Hf and zirconium Zr, and silicates, or aluminates (see para. 21), as in claim 3; wherein said substrate is treated with said treating solution heated in a temperature range between 75 degrees C and 115 degrees C, which encompasses and overlaps applicants' claimed range of about room temperature and 100.degree. C, as in claims 4 and 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

Art Unit: 1765

U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pacheco Rotondaro et al. (2003/0109106 – filed 12/06/2001) in view of Buchanan et al (2003/0230549 – filed 06/03/2002).

Pacheco Rotondaro et al. teaches methods for any suitable process (i.e. treating the substrate), including those used for substrates (see ab.) coated with silicon dioxide or TEOS (i.e. silicon thermal oxidation film) and high-k dielectrics (see para. 19) comprising use of a solution that contains sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4) and hydrofluoric acid (HF), in proportions of 25:0.015, which is encompassed by applicants' specifically claimed range of at most 1% by weight of hydrofluoric acid (HF), as in claims 6 and 7; use of any high-K dielectric material (para. 0018), including oxides of aluminum Al, hafnium Hf and zirconium Zr, and silicates, or aluminates (see para. 21), as in claim 8; wherein said substrate is treated with said treating solution heated in a temperature range between 75 degrees C and 115 degrees C, which encompasses and overlaps applicants' claimed range of about room temperature and 100.degree. C, as in claims 9 and 10.

As to applicants' specifically claimed use of BOE, Pacheco Rotondaro et al. does not explicitly teach the HF compound used in the solution BOE.

Buchanan et al teaches BOE is an effective substitution for HF when etching high-k oxides (see Table 1.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to modify the invention of treating high-k oxides, as Pacheco

Art Unit: 1765

Rotondaro et al., to include substitution BOE as a substitution for HF, as Buchanan et al., because having established that use of BOE to treat high-k materials was in the art, the examiner properly relied, as put forth by the solicitor, on a conclusion of obviousness 'from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.' In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545,549 (CCPA 1969). Further ("The motivation need not be found in the references sought to be combined, but may be found in any number of sources, including common knowledge, the prior art as a whole, or the nature of the problem itself.") In re KSR Int'l v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740-41, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007) quoting In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336-37 (Fed. Cir. 2006); see also DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co., 464 F.3d 1356, 1361, 80 USPQ2d 1641, 1645 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia A. George whose telephone number is (571) 272-5955. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. between 8:00 am and 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



PAG
09/07

Patricia A George
Examiner
Art Unit 1765

DUY-VU N. DEO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

